DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 339 SP 032 962

AUTHOR Whitfield, Truman; Weaver, Janice
TITLE The Demand of Teacher Education Faculty: Some Factors Influencing Employment.
PUB DATE Feb 91
NOTE 63p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Employment Patterns; *Employment Projections; *Employment Qualifications; Faculty Workload; Higher Education; Intellectual Disciplines; National Surveys; Preservice Teacher Education; *Schools of Education; *Teacher Educators
IDENTIFIERS American Association of Colleges for Teacher Educ

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the situation regarding current and projected demand for teacher education faculty in colleges and universities in the United States. The study was an attempt to provide data on the immediate past, present, and future availability of teacher education faculty within various fields. The study was also an attempt to determine the degree of influence various factors had on the employment of faculty in teacher education and to determine whether different types of institutions placed different emphasis on various factors. In addition, the study analyzed the nature of the teaching assignment of faculty in teacher education. The member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (AACTE) were surveyed. Of these, 200 or 28 percent responded. The document presents a detailed report of the findings according to the five parts of the survey instrument used to collect the data: (1) projected faculty needs; (2) projected faculty needs attributed to increased enrollment, retirements, accreditation standards, and affirmative action; (3) employment considerations; (4) reasons for employing new faculty; and (5) information on faculty teaching assignments. Conclusions and recommendations are presented, and a copy of the survey instrument is appended. (IAH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED336339

The Demand of Teacher Education Faculty:

Some Factors Influencing Employment

Dr. Truman Whitfield
Dr. Janice Weaver

College of Education
Murray State University
Murray, Kentucky 42071

February, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Truman Whitfield

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SP 032 962

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Demand of Teacher Education Faculty: Some Factors Influencing Employment

Introduction

Much has been written in recent years concerning the supply and demand of public and private school teachers in grades K-12. Some of the studies conducted within this arena have pointed to factors contributing to both over supply and shortages of teachers within certain fields. The methodology used in various studies of this sort have been both praised and sharply criticized. Regardless of whether one agrees or disagrees with the findings of those studies, at least there have been studies with which one can take issue.

While there have been numerous studies of the supply and demand of teachers in grades K-12, there is a paucity of such research concerning the availability of college and university faculty in teacher education.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current and projected demand picture of teacher education faculty in colleges and universities in the United States. The study was an attempt to provide some data which spoke to the immediate past, present, and future availability of teacher education faculty within various fields. The study was also an attempt to determine the degree of influence various factors had on the employment of faculty in teacher education. An additional set of factors analyzed was the nature of the teaching assignment of faculty in teacher education. An umbrella issue concerning all the aforementioned factors studied was the effort to determine whether different types of institutions (e.g. independent liberal arts colleges, state colleges, state universities, etc.) placed different emphasis on various factors.

The following research questions provide the context for this study:

1. What is the nature of the current and projected demand for faculty within various areas of teacher education?

2. What is the nature of the teaching assignments of teacher education faculty?

3. What factors influence the employment of faculty in teacher education?

4. Are there differences in the influence of selected factors on the employment of teacher education faculty across different types of institutions?

   A. Do representatives of institutions which offer undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education rate selected factors as influencing employment of perspective teacher education faculty differently than do representatives of institutions which do not offer undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education?

   B. Do representatives of institutions which offer undergraduate B.S./B.A. and any Masters in teacher education (M.A., M.S., M.Ed.) rate selected factors as influencing the employment of perspective teacher education faculty differently than do representatives from those institutions which offer only B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education?

   C. Do representatives of institutions which offer a doctorate in teacher education rate selected factors as influencing the employment of perspective teacher education faculty differently than do representatives from institutions which do not offer doctorates in teacher education?

Procedures

The procedures employed in this study involved designing a survey instrument to be completed by all member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, collecting data from those institutions using that instrument, and analyzing the data.

Instrumentation

The draft of the instrument developed for use in this study was initially developed by the researchers. Copies of the instrument were

submitted to an advisory committee consisting of individuals who were members on the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities executive board. The advisory committee provided additional information to be included in the instrument as well as made suggestions regarding the item arrangement within the instrument.

The instrument is divided into six major divisions, each focusing on a given set of factors influencing supply and demand of teacher education faculty. The first section consists primarily of tabled information concerning the number of new hires beginning in 1984 and continuing with projections through 1993-94. In that section respondents were asked to specify the number of new faculty they had employed, or anticipated employing through 1993-94, and to specify the academic areas of employment for those individuals. Section II directed the respondents to rank order, using a four point scale (1 being low and 4 high), the degree to which projected new faculty needs were attributed to increased enrollment, faculty retirements, accreditation standards, or affirmative action.

The third section of the instrument consisted of a number of selected characteristics recent doctorates in teacher education might possess. Respondents were asked to rate, on a four-point Likert scale, the desirability of each of those characteristics in employment practices. Two additional items were included in that section. One item requested the respondents to rate the degree of importance, relative to hiring practices, placed on the institution granting the doctorate. In the final item of that section the respondents were asked to identify the most important factor in hiring decisions. The factors presented as options for that item were: the nature of the doctoral program; the nature of the dissertation; the non-doctoral professional and/or educational experiences of the candidate; the personal

characteristics of the candidate (e.g. human relations, change agent, etc.); the person's readiness to accept challenges of curriculum development.

Section IV of the instrument sought information concerning the number of new hires as a result of given factors. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of new hires due to increased enrollment, retirements, accreditation, affirmative action, or any other reason they might specify.

Section V of the instrument requested information concerning faculty teaching assignments. Of particular interest in that section were the issues of multiple teaching assignments, graduate/undergraduate teaching assignment combinations, and field and clinical involvements. A final item in that section related to the degree to which different faculty functions impacted tenure, promotion and salary decisions. The final section of the instrument was used to secure some basic demographic data on each institution responding. A copy of the instrument employed in this study is located in Appendix A.

Sample

The subjects for this study consisted of all member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Mailing labels for all AACTE member institutions were secured from AACTE headquarters in Washington, D.C. during the Spring of 1989. Instruments were mailed to 720 institutions with responses from 200 (28% response rate) institutions constituting the data pool for this report. While the researchers were not pleased with the low percentage of return, data presented in Tables 1 and 2 and 3 will indicate that those responding do constitute a fairly representative sample of types of teacher education institutions. It should be noted further that due to the nature of the instrument it was not possible to do follow-up mail requests to those institutions not responding initially. The instrument was designed with the belief that the response rate would be

higher, and the nature of the responses more valid and reliable by not having the respondents identify themselves or their institutions.

To provide some insight into the representative nature of the responses obtained, the institutions were broken down by affiliation type as listed in the 1989 AACTE Directory. While not all member institutions have affiliations included in the Directory, the data in Table 1 provide some perspective on those affiliated institutions.

Table 1
AACTE Member Institutional Affiliations

Type of Affiliation	Number
ASC Association of Colleges & Schools of Education in State Universities and Land Grant Colleges & Affiliated Private Universities	100
AIL Association of Independent Liberal Arts Colleges for Teacher Education	139
TECSCU Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities	129

Table 2 is a breakdown of institutions responding by type. The data included in the "% Responding" column represents the percent of the total responding as representative of each type of institution.

Table 2
Institutions Responding by Type

Type of Institution	Number Responding	% Responding
Independent Liberal Arts	56	28
Private University	26	13
State College	36	18
State University	82	41
Total	200	100

As indicated above, and illustrated in Table 1 those responding do constitute a relatively representative sampling of the total number and type of institutions surveyed.

In order to provide a more detailed description of those institutions responding, the demographics were further broken down into the number and percentage of respondents by degree offerings. Data included in Table 3 is illustrative of those demographics. Data presented in the last two columns of Table 3 indicate the number and percentage of the respondents who do not offer the respective programs listed in the first column.

Table 3
Institutions Responding By Type of Degrees Offered

Degree Offered	Frequency Offering	%	Frequency Not Offering	%
B.S./B.A. Only	56	28		
B.S./B.A. and Any Masters	124	62		
B.S./B.A. & Any Grad. Prog.	180	90		
M.A.	85	42	115	58
M.S.	74	37	126	63
M.Ed.	83	41	117	59
E.D.S.	57	28	143	72
Ed.D. only	13	6	187	94
Ph.D. only	10	5	190	95
Ph.D.& Ed.D.	21	11	179	89
Total Doc.	44	22	156	78

Findings

The format for reporting the findings of this study will be parallel to the six parts of the survey instrument used to collect the data.

Part I. Projected Faculty Needs

The original intent of this section of the instrument was to secure data relative to the immediate past (1984-85 to the present) employment picture, with employment projections to 1993-94. Respondents were asked to indicate the program area specialization fields in which they had hired faculty, and the number of faculty they had hired within each of those specialization fields since 1984-85. Furthermore, they were asked to project future needs within those fields through 1993-94. The data concerning past employment practices was not secured in the appropriate form for analysis. Instead of

indicating new hires within each of the fields, some respondents appeared to have specified the total faculty they had on their staff in each field during a given year.

The respondents did, however, provide useful data relative to projected faculty needs. A major concern for the researchers in analyzing the projected faculty needs by fields was the extreme variation in fields identified by the respondents. At the onset of the study the researchers determined that rather than provide the specialization field names and have the respondents attempt to align their needs with those fields, it would be easier for the respondents to specify the fields themselves. Such being the case the numerous fields identified by respondents were first collapsed into a manageable number of fields. Having identified the fields, the projected faculty needs data were assigned to the appropriate field. Tables 4 through 6 contain those projections presented by type of institution, by specialization field, by academic year beginning with 1989-90 and continuing through 1993-94.

Data presented in Table 4 relates to projected faculty needs for colleges and universities offering only undergraduate programs. Of the years covered by those projections there appears to be increased needs in 1989-90, with a slight drop in 1990-91, increasing again in 1991-92. the last two years of the projections (1992-93, and 1993-94) show a significant and steady drop across all departmental clusters. As one might expect those large departmental clusters of Elementary Education and Curriculum and Instruction show the greatest projected needs, with additional needs being evident in special education. A closer examination of the projected needs in Elementary Education indicates that the greatest areas of need will be in early childhood education and elementary general methods. It is interesting that the areas of math, science, and social studies special methods show little projected needs.

Table 4
Projected Faculty Needs for Colleges and
Universities Offering Only Undergraduate Programs

Department/Division	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Curriculum and Instruction					
General Teacher Education/C&I	17	10	15	4	3
Gifted/Talented					
Foundations	2	2	2	1	
Bilingual Education					
Field/Clinical	1				
Educational Psychology					
Total C&I	20	12	17	5	3
Elementary Education					
Early Childhood	9	5	9	3	2
Reading/Language Arts	5	6	6	5	4
Math	2	1	1	1	1
Science					
Social Studies	1				
Elementary Gen. Methods	8	7	3	4	1
Kindergarten					
Total Elementary Education	25	19	19	13	8
Special Education	11	9	11	5	3
Communication Disorders					
Total Special Education	11	9	11	5	3
Secondary Education					
Secondary Gen./Methods	6	2	1	1	1
Science	1	1	1	1	1
Social Studies					
Math					
Language Arts					
Foreign Language					
Music Educaiton/Art Education					
Total Secondary Education	7	3	2	2	2
Voc/Tech (General)	2	2	3	2	2
Business Education					
Industry Arts					
Agriculture					
Home Economics					
Computer Education	1	1	1	2	2
Total Voc/Tech	3	3	4	4	4
HPER	4	2	1	1	
Middle School Education	3	5			
Library Science/Media Center/A.V.	2	2	3	2	1
Graduate Programs					
Administration/Supervision					
Policy & Leadership					
C&I Generalist					
Research					
Guidance/Counseling					
Higher Education					

Correspondingly, the greatest area of need within Curriculum and Instruction is in the arena of general teacher education. Similarly, the projected needs within the Secondary Education area indicate that the greatest need there is for secondary general methods.

Data presented in Table 5 reflects the projected faculty needs for colleges and universities offering undergraduate and graduate programs exclusive of the doctorates. The data presented in Table 5 do not reflect the projected faculty needs of colleges and universities offering only undergraduate programs as represented in Table 4. The years in which non-doctoral institutions show greatest needs are similar to those for institutions offering only undergraduate programs, with some slight differences. There appears to be less drop in the projected needs in 1990-91 as was the case with the institutions offering only undergraduate programs. In addition, the projections for needed faculty extend for more years than was the case with the data presented in Table 4.

As was the case with those institutions offering only undergraduate programs, the data presented in Table 5 indicates that the greatest areas of faculty need for those non-doctoral granting institutions are in Elementary Education, Curriculum and Instruction, and a noticeable increase in need for Special Education. Additionally, the need for generalists (general teacher education/C&I, elementary general methods, and secondary general methods) was the greatest in the non-doctoral granting institutions. There also appears to be a consistently high and extended projected need for special education faculty.

When graduate program faculty needs are addressed two areas show slight, and extended projected needs. Guidance and Counseling, and Administration and Supervision programs show the greatest projected needs among graduate programs in non-doctoral granting institutions.

Data presented in Table 6 reflect projected faculty needs for institutions offering undergraduate and graduate programs including the doctorate. As was the case with the data presented in Tables 4 and 5 the trend of projected needs appears to be greatest in 1989-90. However, unlike the data presented in Tables 4 and 5 the projected needs continue throughout the time periods under study (i.e., through 1993-94). When one examines the program clusters a similar pattern is also evident in that Curriculum and Instruction, Elementary Education, and Special Education show the greatest needs.

An examination of those program clusters showing the greatest need yields patterns similar to those found in the previous two tables. Again, it is the generalists areas which show the greatest need. In Curriculum and Instruction the general field of curriculum and instruction shows the greatest need, departing somewhat from the general teacher education needs in the previous tables. In Elementary Education however, the elementary general methods area shows the greatest needs.

Graduate needs in the areas of Guidance and Counseling, and Administration and Supervision also are evident in the data presented in Table 6.

Part II. Projected Faculty Needs Attributed To Increased Enrollment, Retirements, Accreditation Standards, Affirmative Action

In Part II of the study the respondents were asked to rank order (rate) the degree to which the projected new faculty needs are attributed to increased enrollment, faculty retirements, accreditation standards, and affirmative action. Data provided in response to this section was very inconsistent and, as such was not in a form which would lend itself to analysis.

Table 5
Projected Faculty Needs for Colleges
and Universities -- Non Doctorate

Department/Division	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Curriculum & Instruction	7	4	3	4	1
General Teacher Education/C&I	9	10	8	5	3
Gifted/Talented					
Foundations	3	4	1	2	1
Bilingual Education	1	1	2		
Field/Clinical	1	1	1		
Educational Psychology	1	3	1	2	2
Total C&I	22	23	16	13	7
Elementary Education					
Early Childhood	7	7	3	5	
Reading/Language Arts	7	9	8	5	3
Math	1	1			
Science	1				
Socials Studies					
Elementary Gen. Methods	19	12	12	6	
Kindergarten					
Total Elementary Education	35	29	23	16	3
Special Education	24	17	9	12	7
Communication Disorders	4	1	1		
Total Special Education	24	18	10	11	6
Secondary Education					
Secondary Gen/Methods	11	13	14	6	9
Science	1				
Social Studies					
Math	1				
Language Arts					
Foreign Language					
Music Education/Art Education	2	1	1		
Total Secondary Education	15	14	15	6	9
Voc/Tech (General)	5	7	4	2	2
Business Education	1				
Industrial Arts					
Agriculture					
Home Economics	1	1	1		
Computer Education	1				
Total Voc/Tech	8	8	5	2	2
HPER	11	8	3	2	
Middle School Education	2	1	1		
Library Science/Media Center/A.V.	4	3	1	2	1
Graduate Programs					
Administration/Supervision	11	9	10	2	2
Policy & Leadership					
C&I Generalist	4	2	2		
Research	1				
Guidance/Counseling	13	11	5	2	1
Higher Education					

Table 6
Projected Faculty Needs for Colleges
and Universities Offering Doctorate

Department/Division	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Curriculum & Instruction	16	16	12	14	17
General Teacher Education	2	2	1	1	1
Gifted/Talented					
Foundations	6	5	3	3	2
Bilingual Education	5	4	3		2
Field/Clinical	1	1	1	1	1
Educational Psychology	5	1	1	1	
Total Curriculum & Instruction	35	29	21	20	23
Elementary Education					
Early Childhood	9	8	7	2	1
Reading/Language Arts	8	6	7	4	5
Math					
Science			1	1	
Social Studies			1		
Elementary General Methods	20	16	10	7	10
Kindergarten					
Total Elementary Education	37	30	26	14	16
Special Education	15	21	12	7	9
Secondary Education					
Secondary General Methods	9	5	2	5	2
Science					
Social Studies/History					1
Math		1		1	
Language Arts		1		1	
Foreign Language			1		
Music Education/Art Education				1	
Total Secondary Education	9	7	3	8	3
Voc/Tech (General)	5	11	6	3	3
Business Education	1			1	1
Industrial Arts					2
Agriculture					
Home Economics					
Computer Education	2	3	1		
Total Voc/Tech	8	14	7	4	6
HPER	14	16	8	14	8
Middle School Education	1		1		
Library Science/Media Center/A.V.	2	2	2	1	1
Graduate Programs					
Administration/Supervision	17	19	12	4	8
Policy & Leadership	1	2			1
C&I Generalist	7	6	5	6	3
Research	1		1	2	
Guidance/Counseling	19	15	10	14	11
Higher Education		3	2		

Part III. Employment Considerations

The first section of Part III consisted of a list of selected characteristics that potential faculty just completing doctorates might possess. Respondents were asked to rate on a four point scale (1 being least desirable, and 4 being most desirable) the degree to which they valued each characteristic in employing new faculty. Table 7 contains summary statistics of those ratings. Each factor (characteristic) is presented, followed by the rating scale, each category of which contains the frequency of response and percentage of response for each category, for each factor.

An analysis of the data in Table 7 indicates that in general the predominance of the responses fall within categories 2 and 3 (slightly desirable and desirable). However, there are some factors which did receive noticeably different ratings. Of the seventeen factors included in this section, nine were rated as desirable or most desirable by more than 60% of the total number of those responding to the questionnaire. Those nine items, ranked highest to lowest ratings were: Teaching and Instruction (90%), Prior K-12 Experience (87%), Strong Theoretical Base in the Doctoral Program (68%), Applied Research Emphasis (67%), Applied Emphasis in Dissertation (66%), Prior University Experience (62%), Multicultural Experiences in the Doctoral Program (62%), and Strong Service Record (60%). It should be further noted that the factor "Prior K-12 Experience" received by far the greatest percentage of responses in the most desirable column (80%), while "Teaching and Instruction" was second with 69% of the responses falling in the most desirable column.

Three factors were rated as being least desirable or slightly desirable by 60% or more of the respondents. Those factors were: Record of Grant Acquisition (73%), Training in Grant Writing (61%), and Publications in

Table 7
Ratings of Selected Characteristics of Potential Faculty

Factor	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Qualitative Research Emphasis in Doctorate	24	12	66	33	69	35	35	18
Qualitative Research Emphasis in Doctorate	35	18	66	33	65	33	27	14
Applied Research Emphasis in Doctorate	11	6	51	26	83	42	50	25
Teaching & Instruction Emphasis	7	3	11	6	41	21	137	69
Prior K-12 Experience	10	5	12	6	13	7	160	80
Prior University Experience	24	12	49	25	79	40	43	22
Strong Service Emphasis	22	11	73	37	77	39	22	11
Strong Service Record	17	9	57	29	76	38	44	22
Active in Professional Organizations	9	4	72	36	92	46	22	11
Publications In Refereed Journals	35	18	83	42	55	27	22	11
Strong Theoretical Base in Doctoral Program	14	7	44	22	92	46	44	22
Theoretical Emphasis in Dissertation	24	12	94	47	56	28	20	10
Applied Emphasis in Dissertation	12	6	52	26	97	49	33	17
Training in Grant Writing	36	18	85	43	64	32	10	5
Record of Grant Acquisition	66	33	79	40	35	18	15	8
Strong Human Relations Background	22	11	60	30	73	37	40	20
Multicultural Experiences in Doctorate	13	7	59	30	72	36	52	26

Refereed Journals (60%). It should be noted that even though these items received slightly less than favorable responses, there were none which had a predominance of responses in the least desirable category.

In order to obtain a better picture of the weighting of each of the factors (characteristics) in employment considerations, the data were further analyzed by running cross-tabulations of each factor with other important demographic factors. Among the demographic factors used in these cross-tabulations were: whether or not the institution offered a doctoral program in teacher education, institutions offering only undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs, those offering undergraduate B.S./B.A. and Masters degree (M.S., M.A., M.Ed.) programs, and those institutions offering undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs and any type of graduate program in teacher education.

In running the first cross-tabulation an attempt was made to ascertain whether there was a difference in the degree to which respondents offering B.S./B.A. programs sought different characteristics in faculty they employed than did institutions not offering undergraduate programs. Data presented in Tables 8 through 12 reflect the frequencies and percentages of institutions offering given programs (i.e. undergraduate B.S/B.A. programs vs. those offering no undergraduate programs) where at least 60 % of both categories of respondents rated a given factor as desirable or most desirable. The reader will note a slight discrepancy in the frequency and percentages within some of the tables below. Those discrepancies can be accounted for by nonrespondents to given items.

Table 8
Applied Research Emphasis in Doctorate
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	0	0	2	11	10	56	4	22
Yes	11	6	47	26	73	41	46	26

Table 9
Teaching/Instruction Emphasis in Doctorate
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	2	11	1	5	3	17	11	61
Yes	5	3	10	6	37	21	125	69

Table 10
Prior K-12 Experience
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	2	11	2	11	0	0	12	67
Yes	8	4	9	5	13	7	147	82

Table 11
Strong Theoretical Base in Doctorate
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	3	17	2	11	6	33	6	33
Yes	11	6	42	23	85	47	37	21

Table 12
Planned Multicultural Experiences in Doctoral Program
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	2	11	2	11	4	22	9	50
Yes	11	6	56	31	68	38	42	23

Data presented in Tables 8 through 12 above suggest a strong sense of agreement between both those institutions which do not offer B.S./B.A. programs and those which do on selected factors rated as desirable influences in employment of teacher educators. The strongest agreements exists concerning the factors "strong emphasis in teaching and instruction in the doctoral program," and "prior K-12 teaching or administrative experience".

While the data presented in Tables 8 through 12 suggest strong agreements on certain desirable factors influencing employment of teacher educators, there was one factor which both types of institutions deemed significantly less desirable. As suggested in Table 13 both those institutions not offering B.S./B.A. programs and those offering such programs rated the factor "record of grant acquisition" as either least desirable or slightly desirable as an employment factor.

Table 13
Record of Grant Acquisition
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	5	28	6	33	4	22	2	11
Yes	60	33	72	40	31	17	13	7

In a similar manner, one factor (publication in referred journals) was rated by sixty-one percent (61%) of those institutions not offering undergraduate teacher education programs, and fifty-nine percent (59%) of the institutions offering B.S./B.A. programs as being least desirable or slightly desirable. Data presented in Table 14 depict the ratings on that factor. Admittedly, this finding runs counter to that expected.

Table 14
Publication in Referred Journals
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	4	22	7	39	2	11	4	22
Yes	30	17	76	42	53	29	17	9

There were four factors about which there was considerable disagreement between those institutions not offering B.S./B.A. programs and those offering such programs. Tables 15 through 18 are presentations of data in which at least 60 % of one of the types of institutions responding (those with no B.S./B.A. programs vs. those offering B.S./B.A. programs) rated a given factor as desirable or most desirable.

Table 15
Prior University/College Teaching Experience In Doctorate
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	4	22	6	33	3	16	4	22
Yes	19	10	43	24	75	41	39	21

Table 16
Strong Service Record
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	2	11	6	33	6	33	3	16
Yes	14	8	51	28	69	38	41	23

Table 17
Strong Applied Emphasis in Dissertation
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	2	11	6	33	6	33	2	17
Yes	10	6	45	25	91	51	29	16

Table 18
Training in Grant Writing
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No. Undg. Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No	2	11	6	33	6	33	3	16
Yes	10	6	45	25	91	51	29	16

Data presented in Tables 15 through 18 indicates that when compared to institutions offering no undergraduate programs, those institutions offering B.S./B.A. programs agree that the factors (prior university/college teaching experience, strong service record, strong applied emphasis in dissertation, and training in grant writing) are desirable or most desirable in employment considerations. Data presented in Tables 15 through 18 also indicate that approximately 25% of those institutions offering B.S./B.A. programs view these

factors to be slightly important in employment considerations, with less than 10% of them indicating that the factors are least important.

As indicated above, the first set of cross-tabulations were run to provide insight into the similarities and differences in importance of selected factors influencing the employment of teacher educators. Those cross-tabulations were run on the reports provided by representatives of institutions offering no B.S./B.A. programs and compared to the reports provided by representatives of institutions offering B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education. The second set of cross-tabulations were run to determine whether representatives from institutions offering undergraduate B.S./B.A. and Masters programs in teacher education (M.S., M.A., M.Ed.) rated the same set of selected factors influencing employment of teacher education faculty differently than did representatives from institutions which offer only undergraduate B.A./B.A. programs in teacher education. Data relative to these cross-tabulations are presented in Tables 19 through 33 below.

As was the case in reporting the data in the previous cross-tabulations, the first set of tabled data refer only to those factors in which at least sixty percent (60%) of the respondents from each respective type of institution (i.e., B.S./B.A. and Masters programs, vs. B.S./B.A. programs only) rated a given factor as desirable or most desirable in influencing the employment of teacher education faculty. Data meeting that criterion are presented in Tables 19 through 24 below.

Table 19
Strong Teaching/Instruction Emphasis In Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	2	2	9	7	29	23	82	66
B.S./B.A. Only	3	5	1	2	8	14	43	77

Table 20
Prior Teaching/Administrative Experiences In Public Schools
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	4	3	9	7	11	9	98	79
B.S./B.A. Only	4	7	0	0	2	4	49	88

Table 21
Strong Service Record In Field
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	11	9	35	28	48	39	27	21
B.S./B.A. Only	3	5	16	29	21	38	14	25

Table 22
Strong Theoretical Base Reflected In Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	8	6	25	20	57	46	30	24
B.S./B.A. Only	3	5	17	30	28	50	7	13

Table 23
Strong Applied Emphasis In Dissertation
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	8	6	34	27	60	48	19	15
B.S./B.A. Only	2	4	11	20	31	55	10	18

Table 24
Doctorate Includes Planned Experiences In Multicultural
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	7	6	40	32	42	38	28	23
B.S./B.A. Only	4	7	16	29	21	38	14	25

An examination of the data presented in Tables 19 through 24 indicates a strong agreement across both types of institutions on two of the factors, while suggesting consistently moderate agreement on the remaining factors. The factors "strong teaching/instruction emphasis in doctorate," and "prior teaching/administrative experience in public schools" received by far the highest rating of any of the six factors.

One item, "a record of grant acquisition" was rated as least desirable or slightly desirable by both the institutions offering B.S./B.A. and Masters programs and those institutions only offering B.S./B.A. programs. That cross-tabulation is presented in Table 25. The reader should note the low ratings of those institutions offering only B.S./B.A. programs relative to this factor.

Table 25
A Record of Grant Acquisition
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	32	26	54	44	25	20	10	8
B.S./B.A. Only	28	50	18	32	6	11	3	5

Four of the items were rated as being desirable or slightly desirable factors influencing the employment of teacher educators by at least sixty

percent (60%) of one type of the two types of institutions (i.e., B.S./B.A. and Masters, or B.S./B.A. only). Those four items are presented in Tables 26 through 29.

Table 26
Strong Emphasis In Applied Research In Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	6	5	26	21	54	44	36	29
B.S./B.A. Only	5	9	21	38	19	34	10	18

Table 27
Prior University/College Teaching Experience In Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	15	12	32	26	50	40	24	19
B.S./B.A. Only	4	7	11	20	25	45	15	27

Table 28
Active In Professional Organizations
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	6	5	39	31	60	48	16	13
B.S./B.A. Only	3	5	23	41	25	45	4	7

Table 29
Strong Background In Human Relations In Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	18	15	40	32	37	30	26	21
B.S./B.A. Only	3	5	13	23	29	52	10	18

Data presented in Tables 26 through 29 suggest relatively consistent agreement between these two types of institutions (those offering B.S./B.A. and Masters programs vs. those offering only B.S./B.A. programs) across the four factors. Those institutions offering B.S./B.A. and Masters programs rate a "strong emphasis in applied research," and "active in professional organizations" slightly higher than the comparison group. Perhaps this is due in part to the graduate offerings and involvement with graduate students. In a similar manner, those institutions offering only B.S./B.A. programs tended to rate "prior university.college teaching experience in doctorate," and "strong background in human relations in doctorate" slightly higher than the comparison group.

In contrast to those factors presented in Tables 26 through 29 three factors were rated by sixty percent (60%) of the respondents representing one of those institutions surveyed (those offering both the B.S./B.A. and Masters programs or those institutions offering only the B.S./B.A. program) as being least desirable or slightly desirable influences on the employment of teacher educators. The ratings of those factors are presented in Tables 30 through 32.

Table 30

Strong Quantitative Research Emphasis In Doctorate

With

B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	13	10	36	29	49	40	22	18
B.S./B.A. Only	16	29	26	46	10	18	3	5

Table 31

A Number Of Publications In Referred Journals

With

B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	18	15	46	37	42	34	15	12
B.S./B.A. Only	12	21	30	53	11	20	2	4

Table 32

Training In Grant Writing

With

B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	17	14	54	43	44	35	6	5
B.S./B.A. Only	16	29	24	42	12	21	3	5

The data presented in Tables 30 through 32 indicate that those institutions offering only B.S./B.A. programs consistently rated each of the factors significantly lower than those institutions offering B.S./B.A. and Masters programs. The most significant differences in ratings were on the

factors "number of publications in referred journals," and "strong quantitative research emphasis in doctorate". On those factors, a spread in excess of thirty percentage points was evident.

Only one question resulted in respondents from one type of institution rating a given item as being desirable or most desirable in employing teacher education faculty while the other type of institution rated the same item as being slightly desirable or least desirable. The ratings of that factor are presented in Table 33. The factor, "strong emphasis in qualitative research in doctorate," was rated by sixty-three percent (63%) of those institutions offering B.S./B.A. and Masters programs as being desirable or most desirable. By contrast, sixty-nine percent (69%) of those institutions offering only B.S./B.A. programs rated this factor as least desirable or slightly desirable. Perhaps the most telling information contained in Table 33 is the strength or agreement between both types of institutions in the slightly desirable or desirable categories.

Table 33
Strong Emphasis In Qualitative Research In Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	9	7	33	27	53	43	25	20
B.S./B.A. Only	12	21	27	48	11	20	5	9

The final set of demographics which served as a basis for running cross-tabulations involved comparing the ratings of the seventeen factors influencing employment of teacher educators as provided by either those institutions offering a doctorate in education, or those which do not. Tables 34 through 49 reflect those rating comparisons.

The initial set of comparisons as presented in Tables 34 through 39 reflect the ratings of factors on which there was at least sixty percent (60%) agreement between both types of institutions that the factors were most desirable or desirable in employment considerations.

Table 34
Strong Emphasis In Applied Research In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	1	2	8	18	21	48	13	30
No Doctoral Program	10	6	43	28	61	39	37	24

Table 35
Strong Emphasis In Teaching/Instruction In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	2	5	4	9	18	41	20	45
No Doctoral Program	5	3	7	5	23	15	116	78

Table 36
Prior K-12 Teaching/Administrative Experience
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable		Slightly Desirable		Desirable		Most Desirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	3	7	8	18	7	16	25	57
No Doctoral Program	7	5	3	2	6	4	135	87

Table 37
Strong Theoretical Base In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	2	5	5	11	17	39	19	43
No Doctoral Program	12	8	39	25	75	48	24	15

Table 38
Strong Applied Emphasis In Dissertation
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	1	2	15	34	20	45	7	16
No Doctoral Program	11	7	37	24	76	49	26	17

Table 39
Doctorate Includes Planned Experiences In Multicultural
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	3	7	10	23	17	39	14	32
No Doctoral Program	10	6	48	31	55	35	38	26

Data presented in Tables 34 through 39 indicate an extremely strong level of agreement between these two types of institutions (those offering doctorates and those who offer no doctorate) on the factor "strong emphasis in teaching/ instruction in the doctorate (84% and 94% respectively). In addition, while there was agreement on the rating of the factor "prior K-12 teaching/ administrative experience" ninety-three percent (93%) of the respondents from institutions offering no doctoral programs rated the factor as desirable or most

desirable (note that 87% rated the factor as most desirable), as compared to seventy-three percent (73%) of those institutions offering the doctorate. By contrast, eighty-two percent (82%) of the respondents from institutions offering doctorates rated the factor "strong theoretical base in the doctorate" as desirable or most desirable, compared to sixty-three percent (63%) of the respondents from non-doctoral granting institutions.

There were no factors rated by sixty percent (60 %) of both institutions offering a doctorate and those not offering the doctorate as being least desirable or slightly desirable considerations in employing teacher education faculty.

Three factors were rated by sixty percent (60%) of the respondents of one of the types of institutions (those offering the doctorate, or those which do not) as being desirable or most desirable in employment considerations. Those three factors are presented in Tables 40 through 42.

Table 40
Strong Emphasis In Qualitative Research In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	0	0	4	9	22	50	16	36
No Doctoral Program	24	15	62	40	46	30	19	12

Table 41
Prior University/College Teaching Experience
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	3	7	18	41	15	34	7	16
No Doctoral Program	21	14	30	19	64	41	36	23

Table 42
Strong Record Of Service In Field
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	9	20	17	39	13	30	4	9
No Doctoral Program	8	5	39	25	63	41	40	26

Data presented in Tables 40 through 42 suggest that the two types of institutions being compared (those offering doctorates vs. those not offering doctorates) differ significantly on two of the factors. The most significant point of disagreement is on the factor "strong emphasis in qualitative research in doctorate" where eighty-six percent (86%) of those institutions offering the doctorate rated the factor as desirable or most desirable, compared to only fifty-two percent (52%) of those institutions not offering the doctorate. By contrast, the factor "strong record of service in the field," was rated as desirable or most desirable by a significantly higher percentage of those institutions not offering the doctorate indicate (67%) than those offering such programs (39%). The ratings of the factor "prior university/college teaching experience" were quite similar for both populations.

Four of the factors were rated as least desirable or slightly desirable by at least sixty percent of the respondents from either doctoral granting institutions or those which do not offer doctorates in education. Those cross tabulations are presented in Tables 43 through 46.

Table 43
Strong Emphasis On Service To Their Field In Doctoral Program
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	10	23	23	52	7	16	3	7
No Doctoral Program	12	8	49	32	70	45	19	12

Table 44
Strong Theoretical Base In Dissertation
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	1	2	18	41	15	34	9	20
No Doctoral Program	23	15	76	49	40	26	11	7

Table 45
Training In Grant Writing In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	2	5	23	52	15	34	3	7
No Doctoral Program	34	22	62	40	48	31	7	5

Table 46
Record Of Grant Acquisition
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	10	23	16	36	12	27	5	11
No Doctoral Program	56	36	63	41	22	14	10	6

An examination of the data presented in Tables 43 through 46 indicates that one of the factors "strong emphasis on service to their field in doctoral program" was rated significantly lower by those institutions offering the doctorate than those with no doctoral programs. Seventy-five percent (75%) of the respondents from doctoral granting institutions rated that factor as being least desirable or slightly desirable, while only forty percent (40%) of the non-doctoral institutions rated the factor so low. A slightly less noticeable spread surfaced in the ratings of the factor "strong theoretical base in dissertation" where sixty-three percent (63%) of those institutions with no doctoral programs rated the factor as least desirable or slightly desirable, as compared to forty three percent (43%) of the doctoral granting institutions.

The last set of cross-tabulations run on the ratings from those respondents from institutions offering the doctorate in teacher education and those from institutions which do not offer doctorates are presented in Tables 47 through 49. Data included in those tables represent those factors which sixty percent (60%) of the respondents from doctoral granting institutions rated desirable or most desirable, while sixty percent (60%) of the respondents from non-doctoral institutions rated them slightly desirable or least desirable. Three factors fell into this category; "strong emphasis in quantitative research in doctorate," "number publications in referred journals," and, "strong background in human relations in doctorate." Data reflective of those ratings are presented in Tables 47 through 49.

Table 47
Strong Emphasis In Quantitative Research In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	1	2	4	9	21	48	16	36
No Doctoral Program	34	30	62	40	43	28	11	7

Table 48
Number of Publications In Referred Journals
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	5	11	11	25	13	30	14	32
No Doctoral Program	30	19	71	46	42	27	8	5

Table 49
Strong Background In Human Relations In Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctoral Program vs. No Doctoral Program	Least Desirable Freq.	%	Slightly Desirable Freq.	%	Desirable Freq.	%	Most Desirable Freq.	%
Doctoral Program	6	17	20	45	10	23	7	16
No Doctoral Program	16	10	40	26	63	41	32	21

The factor "strong emphasis in quantitative research in doctorate" resulted in the strongest rating dichotomy. A significantly higher percentage of the representatives of institutions offering the doctorate (84%) rated that factor as desirable or most desirable while seventy percent (70%) of the representatives from non-doctoral institutions rated the factor as least desirable or slightly desirable.

Two additional sets of factors influencing the employment of teacher educators are included in Part II of the questionnaire used in this study. Question #2 asked that the respondents indicate (by rating as extremely important, important, of little importance or not important at all) the importance they ascribed to the institution awarding the doctorate. Question # 3 asked the respondents to select from among five factors (the nature of the doctoral program; the nature of the dissertation; the non-doctoral and professional educational experiences of the candidate; the personal characteristics of the candidate; the person's readiness to accept challenges of curriculum development) the factor which they deemed most important in hiring decisions.

In order to determine more precisely the intricacies of the ratings provided in response to Question #2 in Part III, three cross-tabulations were run on the data obtained. The first cross-tabulation was run to determine whether respondents from institutions offering B.S./B.A. programs rated the factors differently than those respondents from institutions not offering B.S./B.A. programs. That cross-tabulation is presented in Table 50.

Table 50
Importance Ascribed to Institution Awarding Doctorate
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No Undergraduate Programs Vs. B.S./B.A. Programs	Extremely Important		Important		Of Little Importance		Not Important	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No Undergraduate Programs	3	17	15	83	0	0	0	0
B.S./B.A. Programs	44	24	109	61	22	12	1	.5

As indicated in Table 50 all of the respondents (100) from institutions offering no undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education rated the importance of the institution granting the doctorate as extremely important or important. In a similar manner eighty-five percent (85%) of the respondents

from institutions offering undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education rated the importance of the institution granting the doctorate as extremely important or important. (The reader will note that there were a few non-responses to this item from both types of institutions.)

The second cross-tabulation on this variable compared the ratings of respondents from institutions which offered both B.S./B.A. and Masters programs to those of respondents from institutions offering only B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education. Data representing those cross-tabulations are presented in Table 51.

Table 51
Importance Ascribed To Institution Awarding Doctorate
With
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs Only

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Extremely Important		Important		Of Little Importance		Not Important	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A. and Masters	35	28	77	62	9	7	1	1
B.S./B.A. Only	9	16	32	57	13	23	0	0

Data presented in Table 51 indicate that of those respondents from institutions offering both the B.S./B.A. and Masters programs in teacher education, 90% rate the importance of the institution granting the doctorate as extremely important or important, with a heavier weighting in the important category. Similarly, 73% of the respondents from institutions offering only the B.S./B.A. in teacher education rated the significance of the institution offering the doctorate as extremely important or important, with a weighting in the important column. Twenty-three percent (23%) of the respondents from those institutions offering only the B.S./B.A. program in teacher education rated the importance of the doctoral granting institution as of little importance.

The third set of cross-tabulations run on the factor, importance of the institution granting the doctorate, was run to determine whether there was a difference in the ratings from respondents from doctoral granting institutions when compared to those ratings of respondents from non-doctoral granting institutions. The data representing those cross-tabulations are found in Table 52.

Table 52
Importance Ascribed To Institution Awarding Doctorate
With
Offer Doctoral Programs vs. No Doctoral Programs Offered

Doctoral Programs vs. No Doctoral Programs	Extremely Important		Important		Of Little Importance		Not Important	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Doctoral Programs	16	36	25	57	2	5	0	0
No Doctoral Programs	30	19	100	65	21	14	1	1

As can be seen in Table 52 there was a strong agreement between the ratings from both those institutions awarding the doctorate and non-doctoral granting institutions on the importance placed on the institution awarding the doctorate in employment practices.

The final item in Part III of the questionnaire sought to determine the most important factor respondents considered in employment practices. Three cross-tabulations were again run on the ratings of these factors. The data representing those cross-tabulations are presented in Tables 53 through 55.

The first cross-tabulation relative to the ratings of the five factors presented in Item 3, Part III of the questionnaire was run to determine whether respondents from institutions having undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education rated the factors differently than those respondents from institutions not offering undergraduate programs in teacher education. Table 53 includes a presentation of those cross-tabulations.

Table 53
Most Important Factor In Employment Decisions
With
No Undergraduate Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

No B.S./B.A. vs. B.S./B.A.	Nature of Doctorate		Nature of Dissertation		Professional Experiences		Personal Characteristics		Ready for Challenge	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No B.S./B.A.	1	5	2	11	4	22	8	44	2	11
B.S./B.A.	27	15	1	.5	55	31	57	32	9	5

An examination of the data presented in Table 53 indicates that the factors professional experience and personal characteristics are the variables which most of the respondents from both those institutions not offering undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education and those from institutions offering such programs rated the highest.

The second cross-tabulation relative to the rating of the five factors presented in Item #3 Part III of the questionnaire was run to compare the ratings of respondents from institutions which offered B.S./B.A. and Masters programs to those from institutions which offer only B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education. Those cross-tabulations are presented in Table 54.

Table 54
Most Important Factor In Employment Decisions
B.S./B.A. and Masters Programs vs. B.S./B.A. Programs

B.S./B.A. and Masters vs. B.S./B.A. Only	Nature of Doctorate		Nature of Dissertation		Professional Experiences		Personal Character		Ready for Challenge	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
B.S./B.A./Mast.	104	84	5	4	12	10	1	1	0	0
B.S./B.A. Only	52	93	2	4	1	1	0	0	1	1

It is evident from an analysis of the data presented in Table 54 that a strong agreement exist between the two types of institutions being compared in that both rated the nature of the doctorate as the most significant factor in employment considerations (84% for B.S./B.A. and Masters, and 93% for

B.S./B.A. only). These ratings differed significantly from the ratings reported in Table 53 above. There the nature of the doctorate received relatively low ratings by the respondents from other types of institutions. Only five percent (5%) of the respondents from institutions with no undergraduate programs rated the item as most important while fifteen (15%) of the respondents from institutions offering B.S./B.A. programs rated the item most important in hiring considerations.

The final cross-tabulation related to Item #3, Part III of the questionnaire was run to provide insight into the ratings of the five factors as provided by representatives from institutions offering a doctorate and those not offering doctorates in teacher education. Data concerning this cross-tabulation are presented in Table 55.

Table 55
Most Important Factor In Employment Decisions
With
Doctoral Program Offered vs. No Doctoral Program Offered

Doctorate vs. No Doctorate	Nature of Doctorate		Nature of Dissertation		Professional Experiences		Personal Character		Ready for Challenge	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Doctorate	13	30	1	2	6	14	14	32	2	5
No Doctorate	16	10	2	1	53	34	51	33	9	6

Data presented in Table 55 suggest the greatest variance in rating of factors deemed most important in employment practices thus far. When compared to the cross-tabulations of the ratings presented in Tables 53 and 54 the variances become quite evident. As presented in Table 55, respondents from institutions granting doctorates varied considerable among themselves in their ratings of the factors. Two factors did receive a majority of the ratings (nature of the doctorate and personal characteristics with 30% and 32% respectively. Those institutions not awarding the doctorate also rated the items differently among themselves. Again, two items,

professional experiences, and, personal characteristics, received a majority of the ratings with 34% and 33% respectively.

Part IV of the questionnaire sought information relative to reasons different institutions employed new faculty. Respondents were asked to indicate the number of new faculty they had employed for the years 1984-85 through 1988-89 for each of a number of specified reasons (i.e., increased enrollment, replacement/retirement, accreditation, affirmative action, or other reasons which they might specify). Similarly, the respondents were asked to project the number of new hires for the years 1989-90 through 1993-94, and to specify the number of new hires for the same reasons. The data obtained in response to this section of the questionnaire were classified according to four types of institutions: Doctoral granting universities; non-doctoral granting universities; state colleges; private universities; and, Independent liberal arts colleges. Data relative to these frequency reports are presented by type of institution, as indicated in the preceding sentence, and are reported in Tables 56 through 60. All the data relative to these factors is summarized and presented in Table 61.

Table 56
Factors Contributing To New Hires In Doctoral Granting Universities
By
Frequencies of Actual and Projected New Hires 1984-85 Through 1993-94

	Actual					Projected				
Factors	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment	14	17	29	27	33	56	39	31	22	24
Replacement/ Retirement	27	50	60	44	73	66	55	45	50	49
Accreditation	1	1	2	6	0	11	12	8	2	0
Affirmative Action	0	3	5	7	7	3	2	1	1	1
New Programs	3	0	3	1	0	1	6	0	0	0

N = 37 Percent of useable responses = 87%

Table 57
Factors Contributing To New Hires In Non-Doctoral Universities
By
Frequencies of Actual and Projected New Hires 1984-85 Through 1993-94

Factors	Actual					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment	7	10	22	25	36	46	47	25	21	22
Replacement/ Retirement	17	23	37	65	73	79	83	71	67	67
Accreditation	0	3	2	12	11	14	17	6	6	3
Affirmative Action	4	3	2	5	6	6	2	3	6	4
New Programs	0	0	0	0	1	5	7	7	6	6

N = 50; Percent of useable responses = 94%

Table 58
Factors Contributing To New Hires In State Colleges
By
Frequencies of Actual and Projected New Hires 1984-85 Through 1993-94

Factors	Actual					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment	6	5	6	6	26	24	20	11	16	7
Replacement/ Retirement	11	6	16	14	30	33	31	17	21	21
Accreditation	0	0	0	0	4	5	6	6	3	3
Affirmative Action	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
New Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

N = 34; Percent of useable responses = 82%

Table 59
Factors Contributing To New Hires In Private Universities
By
Frequencies of Actual and Projected New Hires 1984-85 Through 1993-94

Factors	Actual					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment	0	3	7	3	11	9	9	6	4	8
Replacement/ Retirement	5	7	7	7	9	14	5	4	2	8
Accreditation	2	1	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0
Affirmative Action	0	0	1	1	2	3	1	1	0	0
New Programs	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0

N = 25; Percent of useable responses = 80%

Table 60
Factors Contributing To New Hires In Independent Lib. Arts Colleges
By
Frequencies of Actual and Projected New Hires 1984-85 Through 1993-94

Factors	Actual					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment	4	7	11	13	15	20	19	14	4	5
Replacement/ Retirement	8	1	8	10	16	15	13	9	7	9
Accreditation	1	1	0	0	1	2	4	1	2	0
Affirmative Action	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0
New Programs	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

N = 52; Percent of useable responses = 90%

Table 61
Factors Contributing To New Hires Across All Institutions
By
Frequencies of Actual and Projected New Hires 1984-85 Through 1993-94

Factors	Actual					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment	31	42	75	74	121	155	134	87	67	66
Replacement/ Retirement	68	87	128	140	201	207	187	146	147	154
Accreditation	4	6	5	18	16	33	40	23	13	6
Affirmative Action	4	8	10	15	16	13	5	5	7	5
New Programs	4	0	3	1	1	7	13	8	6	6
Grand Totals	111	143	221	248	355	415	379	269	240	237

N = 198

An examination of the data presented in Tables 56 through 61 reveals some interesting findings. It is clear that the single most important reason for new hires is replacement and/or retirement of existing faculty. The second leading factor contributing to employment of new faculty is increased enrollment. It is also evident that affirmative action and new programs provide very little emphasis on hiring of new faculty.

As one examines Tables 56 through 61 for other trends, the fact that there is a gradual increase in new hires up to 1988-89, and then there is a significant increase for the next three years (1988-89 through 1990-91). This jump in new hires is already being felt throughout the country as enrollment in teacher education programs increase dramatically, and as existing faculty either retire or move about within the higher education system.

The issue of accreditation seems to contribute somewhat to the increase in hires in teacher education faculty. An examination of the data

in Tables 56 through 61 indicates that the most significant jump in new hires due to accreditation occurs in 1987-88, with even more significant jumps continuing until 1991-92. These increases in significance seems to be closely tied to increased demands in certification under the new N.C.A.T.E. standards.

Part V of the questionnaire was an attempt to obtain information concerning faculty teaching assignments. As such the section was broken into five questions. Question #1 of Part V asked the respondents to indicate the desirability of multiple teaching assignments. Respondents were asked to indicate whether multiple teaching assignments were essential and desirable, essential yet undesirable, non-essential yet desirable, or non-essential and undesirable. A series of cross-tabulations were run on the responses to this item in an attempt to ascertain whether the type of institution from which the respondent came impacted their perceptions of the essentiality of multiple teaching assignments. The result of those cross-tabulations are contained in Table 62.

Table 62
Desirability Of Multiple Teaching Assignments
By
Type Of Institution With Given Program Offerings

Type of Programs	Essential And Desirable		Essential Yet Undesirable		Non-Essent. Yet Desirable		Non-Essent. And Undesirable	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
No B.S./B.A.	15	83	3	17	0	0	0	0
B.S./B.A. Only	52	93	2	4	1	1	0	0
B.S./B.A. and Masters	104	84	5	4	12	10	1	1
B.S./B.A. and Other Graduate Programs	156	87	7	4	13	7	1	.5
Non-Doctoral Granting	141	91	6	4	4	3	1	1
Doctoral Granting	30	68	4	9	9	20	1	2

Data presented in Table 62 suggests very clearly that all of the types of institutions strongly support the notion of multiple teaching assignments. Those institutions offering only B.S./B.A. programs and non-doctoral granting institutions (many of which are B.S./B.A. only institutions) are strongly in favor of multiple teaching assignments. By contrast, doctoral granting institutions seem to place much less significance on multiple teaching assignments.

Item #2, Part V of the questionnaire sought information relative to the nature of teaching assignments of faculty. Of particular interest was the degree to which were made, and the nature of those multiple teaching assignments. Respondents were asked to indicate the most common multiple teaching combinations used by their institutions.

The responses to this item resulted in a wide range of teaching combinations being identified. The combinations specified by the respondents were classified into like types of teaching assignments. For example, specific methods courses identified by the respondents were collapsed into a heading called "Methods". Other such categories were created in a similar manner. Those categories and the frequencies of their occurrence across each type of institution responding are presented in Table 63.

Table 63
Multiple Teaching Assignments By Type Of Institution

Assignments	Doctoral Granting University	Non-Doctoral University	State College	Private University	Ind. Lib. Arts
Methods/Student Teaching/ Practicum Supervision	10	38	18	16	31
Undergraduate Methods Combinations	11	11	9	2	13
Graduate/Undergraduate Course Combinations	8	11	3	5	10
Graduate Core/ Graduate Specialty	7	6	2	0	0
Discipline (Content Specialty)/ Supervision	3	0	1	3	5
Methods/Content Specialty	0	2	1	2	13
Administration/Undg. or Graduate Teaching	0	1	3	2	1
Undg. or Grad. Teaching/ Thesis/Dissertation Supervision	21	1	0	1	0

The data in Table 63 are frequency counts of multiple teaching assignments utilized in all the institutions responding to the survey. The frequencies do not represent one multiple teaching assignment for each respondent, rather the frequencies represent the number of times specific types of multiple teaching assignments, so classified, were specified by respondents.

An examination of the data presented in Table 63 indicates that all types of institutions responding do utilize some form of multiple teaching assignments. Clearly the heaviest weighting of those kinds of assignments involve some type of teaching assignment combined with student teaching or practicum supervision. It is equally evident that non-doctoral granting universities and independent liberal arts schools are heavily involved in

multiple teaching assignments in that arena, with state colleges and private universities close behind. It is also evident, as one would suspect, that doctoral granting institutions are the primary utilizers of assigned time for faculty supervision of theses or dissertations. In addition, it is no surprise that the independent liberal arts institutions are the chief contributors to the use of faculty from academic disciplines to teach professional methods and content methods specialties.

Two questions in Part V of the questionnaire sought information concerning the coverage of field and clinical supervision functions in teacher education programs. Respondents were asked to indicate the approximate percentage of responsibility for supervision that was assumed by different types of individuals at their institution (i.e., college/university faculty; graduate assistants; public school personnel/clinical instructors; or others which they were to specify). In a separate question respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of field instruction responsibility for each of the same types of individuals for the years 1993-94. Data presented in Table 64 reflect the current percentages of of responsibility for supervision of field or clinical experiences by different personnel.

Table 64
Current Percentage of Responsibility
For
Supervision of Field and Clinical Experiences

Type of Institution	College Univ. Faculty	Graduate Assistants	Public School Personnel	Adjunct Faculty
Ind. Lib. Arts	83.75	0.0	10.11	6.14
Private University	77.62	1.43	12.71	15.24
University Non-Doctorate	77.89	1.02	12.85	18.91
State College	80.1	1.75	11.99	7.26
University Doctorate	56.77	22.0	11.40	9.4

Data presented in Table 64 clearly indicates that across all types of institutions surveyed a minimum or seventy-seven percent (77.62%) of the responsibility for supervision of field and clinical experiences rests with college or university faculty except in the case of universities offering doctorates where only 56.77% of the supervision is a faculty responsibility. In doctoral granting institutions twenty-two percent (22%) of the field and clinical supervision is assigned to graduate assistants as compared to a high of 1.75% among the other types of institutions. By contrast, non-doctoral granting universities, and private universities employ significantly more adjunct faculty for field and clinical supervision (18.91% and 15.24% respectively). All types of institutions surveyed employ about the same percentage of public school personnel to supervise field and clinical experiences (approximately 12%).

Data relative to the projected percentage of responsibility for supervision of field and clinical experiences in the academic year 1993-94 are presented in Table 65.

Table 65
Projected Percentage of Responsibility
For
Supervision of Field and Clinical Experiences

Type of Institution	College Univ. Faculty	Graduate Assistants	Public School Personnel	Adjunct Faculty
Ind. Lib. Arts	80.45	.23	12.32	7.05
Private University	72.62	1.43	12.14	4.81
University Non-Doctorate	71.96	1.63	15.31	11.10
State College	75.48	21.87	16.23	7.10
University Doctorate	53.6	21.87	19.28	6.71

As was the case with the data presented in Table 64 concerning current utilization of personnel in supervision of field and clinical experiences,

similar staffing patterns evolved in the 1993-93 academic year projections. Data presented in Table 65 indicates that in excess of seventy-one percent (71.96%) of the supervision of field and clinical experiences is performed by regular faculty in all types of institutions surveyed except doctoral granting institutions where slightly over fifty-three percent (53.6%) of the supervision is done by university faculty. One noticeable difference in actual and projected assignments for supervision is also evident in Table 65. A noticeable increase in the percentage of graduate assistants being assigned field and clinical supervision responsibilities surfaced in the projection year.

The final item in Part V of the was an attempt to determine the relative weighting of faculty functions (i.e., teaching, research, and service) in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. Respondents were asked to assign percentages to each of the faculty functions as they perceive them to impact upon tenure, promotion and salary determinations. Data relative to these issues was analyzed, and are presented herein according to the type of institution responding. Those data are presented in Tables 66 through 70.

Table 66
Percentage Of Weighting Of Teaching, Research, and Service
In Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Decisions
Across
Independent Liberal Arts Colleges

	Tenure	Promotion Assoc./Prof.		Salary Decisions
Teaching	66.31	62.57	61.49	61.28
Research/Publications	11.04	12.89	14.11	10.94
Service Including Administration	17.25	18.86	18.73	19.78

Table 67
Percentage Of Weighting Of Teaching, Research, and Service
In Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Decisions
Across
State Colleges

	Tenure	Promotion Assoc./Prof.		Salary Decisions
Teaching	62.22	58,98	54.91	57.5
Research/Publications	17.51	20.25	21.32	17.65
Service Including Administration	14.51	14.32	14.25	14.28

Table 68
Percentage Of Weighting Of Teaching, Research, and Service
In Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Decisions
Across
Non-Doctoral Granting Institutions

	Tenure	Promotion Assoc./Prof.		Salary Decisions
Teaching	57.05	54.92	50.67	56.05
Research/Publications	24.73	26.04	28.37	22.42
Service Including Administration	18.57	19.15	19.72	19.11

Table 69
Percentage Of Weighting Of Teaching, Research, and Service
In Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Decisions
Across
Private Universities

	Tenure	Promotion Assoc./Prof.		Salary Decisions
Teaching	50.40	48.25	46.11	46.49
Research/Publications	32.54	33.97	37.78	31.49
Service Including Administration	16.11	16.82	15.63	20.96

Table 70
Percentage Of Weighting Of Teaching, Research, and Service
In Tenure, Promotion, and Salary Decisions
Across
Doctoral Granting Institutions

	Tenure	Promotion Assoc./Prof.		Salary Decisions
Teaching	42.82	40.79	35.70	42.30
Research/Publications	36.70	39.12	44.06	33.76
Service Including Administration	20.67	19.58	22.03	20.21

Data presented in Tables 66 through 70 indicate that independent liberal arts colleges and state colleges consistently agree on the amount of weighting allocated to teaching, research, and service as a function of tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. Furthermore, data in those tables indicate that non-doctoral granting institutions and private universities also share common perspectives on these issues, and that they place slightly less emphasis on teaching and more emphasis on research as impacting tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. The information in Tables 66 through 70 also clearly indicates that private universities and doctoral granting institutions place considerably lower emphasis on teaching combined with a much greater emphasis on research in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. It is equally clear from the data in Tables 66 through 70 that service receives considerably less weighting on tenure, promotion, and salary determinations across all types of institutions surveyed.

Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Summary

The purpose of this study was to investigate the current and projected demand picture of teacher education faculty in colleges and universities in the United States. The study was an attempt to provide some data which spoke

to the immediate past, present, and future availability of teacher education faculty within various fields. The study was also an attempt to determine the degree of influence various factors had on the employment of faculty in teacher education. An additional set of factors analyzed was the nature of the teaching assignment of faculty in teacher education. An umbrella issue concerning all the aforementioned factors studied was the effort to determine whether different types of institutions (e.g. independent liberal arts colleges, state colleges, state universities, etc.)placed different emphasis on various factors.

The following research questions provide the context for this study:

1. What is the nature of the current and projected demand for faculty within various areas of teacher education?

2. What is the nature of the teaching assignments of teacher education faculty?

3. What factors influence the employment of faculty in teacher education?

4. Are there differences in the influence of selected factors on the employment of teacher education faculty across different types of institutions?

   A. Do representatives of institutions which offer undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education rate selected factors as influencing employment of perspective teacher education faculty differently than do representatives of institutions which do not offer undergraduate B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education?

   B. Do representatives of institutions which offer undergraduate B.S./B.A. and any Masters in teacher education (M.A., M.S., M.Ed.) rate selected factors as influencing the employment of perspective teacher education faculty differently than do representatives from those institutions which offer only B.S./B.A. programs in teacher education?

   C. Do representatives of institutions which offer a doctorate in teacher education rate selected factors as influencing the employment of perspective teacher education faculty differently than do representatives from institutions which do not offer doctorates in teacher education?

The procedures employed in this study involved designing a survey instrument to be completed by all member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, collecting data from those institutions using that instrument, and analyzing the data.

The draft of the instrument developed for use in this study was initially developed by the researchers. Copies of the instrument were submitted to an advisory committee consisting of individuals who were members on the Teacher Education Council of State Colleges and Universities executive board. The advisory committee provided additional information to be included in the instrument as well as made suggestions regarding the item arrangement within the instrument.

The subjects for this study consisted of all member institutions of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Mailing labels for all AACTE member institutions were secured from AACTE headquarters in Washington, D.C. during the Spring of 1989. Instruments were mailed to 720 institutions with responses from 200 (28% response rate) institutions constituting the data pool for this report.

Conclusions

This study resulted in a number of interesting, if not significant conclusions. Those conclusions are presented below, and are organized along the same lines as the instrument used to collect the data, and as presented in the findings section above.

1. Relative to perceived faculty needs, three conclusions can be drawn. Across all types of institutions there will be increased faculty needs through 1991, followed by a significant drop in needs for the remainder of the projected period for the study. The curricular needs tend to cluster around the "generalist" fields (i.e., curriculum and instruction generalist favoring teacher education; general methods at the elementary

and secondary levels). Most of the consistent needs are a function of replacements, with some slight increase in needs being realized in conjunction with the latest NCATE standards.

2. A number of conclusions relate to the relative importance respondents placed on a given set of factors, or characteristics sought in the employment of new faculty. The two major factors sought in the employment of new faculty were "a strong emphasis in teaching and instruction in the doctoral program," and "prior K-12 teaching or administrative experiences" (90% and 87% respectively).
3. The three factors which were rated as least desirable or slightly desirable characteristics in employment considerations across all types of institutions were; "a record of grant acquisition," "training in grant writing," and, "a number of publications in referred journals" (73%, 61%, and 59% respectively).
4. When pair-wise comparisons were made between different types of institutions, there was significant variability in the desirability of characteristics sought by different types of institutions when employing new faculty.
5. With reference to the relative importance placed on the nature of the institution granting the doctorate, a significant percentage of the institutions responding indicated that that factor was extremely important or important, with a range of 77% to 100%, depending upon the type of institution.
6. When considering the factors (nature of doctorate, nature of dissertation, professional experiences, personal characteristics, and a readiness to accept challenges) there was significant variability across institution type in terms of the degree of importance placed on each factor.

7. A relatively high percentage of all types of institutions rated multiple teaching assignments as essential and desirable (68% for doctoral granting institutions to 93% for institutions which offer only B.S./B.A. programs). The most heavily used multiple teaching assignment was some form of methods course combined with supervision of field and clinical experiences.
8. All types of institutions surveyed utilize primarily college/university faculty to supervise field and clinical experiences. However, there was significant variance in that doctoral granting institutions averaged assigning 56.77% of their faculty to field and clinical supervision, while the range in percentage of assignment of faculty in non-doctoral, private, or liberal arts institutions to supervision of field and clinical experiences was 77% to 84% respectively.
9. The relative weighting of teaching, research, and service in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions varies significantly across type of institution. Independent liberal arts institutions and state colleges place a significantly higher weighting on teaching than any other factor. By contrast, private universities and doctoral granting institutions place a significantly lower, yet balanced weighting on teaching and research. It is quite evident that across all types of institutions surveyed, service receives a significantly lower rating in tenure, promotion, and salary decisions than does any factor.

Recommendations

Three recommendations are made as a result of this study.

1. Colleges and universities need to examine very closely, noting obvious discrepancies, the characteristics they value in employing new faculty as compared to faculty expectations once employed.

2. Colleges and universities need to examine the relative importance they place on teaching, research, and service, with a particular emphasis on service, in making tenure, promotion, and salary decisions. With increased needs surfacing which require more teacher education institutions to become actively involved with their constituent publics, more attention needs to be given service.
3. Portions of the study need to be conducted again. Specifically, Part III, Employment Considerations, of the instrument employed in this study needs to be submitted to doctoral granting institutions in order to ascertain the degree to which they prepare faculty relative to each of the selected characteristics sought in employing new faculty. The findings of such a survey need to be compared to those findings of this study, noting any discrepancies which might exist between those training faculty and those employing them.

APPENDIX A

Survey

I. Please list the program areas (Specialization fields; e.g. C & I teacher ed., reading, etc.) in your college. Following each program area specify the number of faculty employed for the years 1984-85 through 1988-89, and projected faculty needs (including new lines and replacement faculty) for the years 1989-90 through 1993-94.

Program Areas Specialization Field	Employed					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94

II. Rank order (1=low, 4=high) the degree to which the projected new faculty (new lines or replacements) needs are attributed to the following:

Program Areas Specialization Field	Increased Enrollment	Faculty Retiring	Accreditation Standards	Affirmative Action

III. Employment Considerations

1. Below is a list of selected characteristics that potential faculty just completing their doctoral program might possess. Using a scale of 1 to 4 (with 1 being the least desirable and 4 being the most desirable) rate each of the characteristics listed.

____ Strong emphasis in qualitative research in their doctoral program (e.g. courses in research, research design, statistics).

____ Strong emphasis in quantitative research in their doctoral program (e.g. courses in research, research design, statistics).

____ Strong emphasis in applied research in their doctoral program.

____ Strong emphasis in teaching and instruction in their doctoral program.

____ Prior teaching or administrative experiences in public schools (K-12).

____ Prior university/college teaching experiences as part of their doctoral program (e.g. teaching assistant, teaching courses, etc.).

____ Strong emphasis of service to their field in their doctoral program.

____ Strong record of service in their field.

____ Active in professional organization(s).

____ A number of publications in referred journals.

____ A strong theoretical base that is reflected in their doctoral program.

____ Dissertation has a strong theoretical emphasis.

____ Dissertation has a strong applied emphasis.

____ Training in grant writing in their doctoral program.

____ A record of grant acquisition.

____ Strong background in human relations in their doctoral program (e.g. courses in humanistic psychology, group dynamics, interpersonal relations, etc.).

____ Doctoral program includes planned experiences in multi-cultural settings.

2. Please indicate the importance you ascribe to the institution awarding the doctorate in your hiring decision by checking one of the following.

____ Extremely important ____ Important

____ Of little importance ____ Not important at all

3. Which of the following is the most important factor you consider in your hiring decisions?

____ The nature of the doctoral program

____ The nature of the dissertation

____ The non-doctoral professional and/or educational experiences of the candidate

____ The personal characteristics of the candidate (e.g. how a person relates to others, will the person be a change agent? etc.)

____ The person's readiness to accept challenges of curriculum development

IV. For each of the years 1984-85 through 1993-94 please indicate the number of new hires (new or replacement lines) due to each of the following

	Actual					Projected				
	84-85	85-86	86-87	87-88	88-89	89-90	90-91	91-92	92-93	93-94
Increased Enrollment										
Retirement										
Accreditation										
Affirmative Action										
Other Please Specify										

V. Faculty Teaching Assignments

1. Multiple teaching assignments (i.e. science methods and student teaching supervision; curriculum development and research methods, etc.) at my institution are:

_____ Essential and Desirable

_____ Non essential yet Desirable

_____ Essential yet Undesirable

_____ Non essential and Undesirable

2. If multiple teaching assignments are employed at your institution, please indicate the most common combinations used.

_____

_____

_____

_____

3. Faculty at my institution teach predominately: Check all that apply

_____Undergraduate _____Graduate MA/MS/MED

_____Graduage Ed.S. _____Graduate Ed.D/Ph.D.

4. Field experience instruction is currently provided by college or university faculty, graduate assistants, public school personnel, or adjunct faculty. Please indicate the approximate percentage of responsibility for each as employed by your institution.

_____College/university faculty _____Graduate assistants

_____Public school personnel/clinical instructors

_____Other adjunct instructors

5. What will be the percentage of field experience instruction responsibility by 1993-94?

_____College/university faculty _____Graduate assistants

_____Public school personnel/clinical instructors

_____Other adjunct instructors

6. Please indicate a percentage weighting of teaching, research, service as used by your institution for determining tenure, promotion, and/or salary decisions.

	Tenure	Promotion Assoc	Prof	Salary Decisions
Teaching				
Research/Publications				
Service (Including Administration)				